REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the present application. Claim 1-29 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b). Claims 1, 4, 12, 20, and 24 have been amended.

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough examination of the subject application and respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application based on the above amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-29 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,134,432 to Holmes, et al. ("Holmes" or the "Holmes Reference"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the grounds for rejection for the reasons provided below.

The invention as claimed provides a network operator, system and methods for providing a plurality of wireless applications from one or more wireless application operators to one or more personal communication system ("PCS") carriers regardless of the air interface protocol of the PCS carriers.

In contrast, the Holmes reference discloses a Short Message Services gateway for wireless network operators, wherein electronic messages, i.e., "email", originating from the Internet, a LAN, or any other source, can be routed to and received from a wireless device addressee, e.g., mobile telephone. See, e.g., Holmes, col. 1, line 66 to col. 2, line 21. Accordingly, the Holmes reference teaches means for providing a single wireless application (i.e., email) to wireless customers; whereas, the present invention teaches providing multiple wireless applications to customers of PCS networks, which, heretofore, were accustomed to receiving voice only transmissions.

Holmes, further teaches providing a single wireless application using a common communication protocol, i.e., wireless digital standard, e.g., the Global System for Mobile Communication. See, e.g., Id., col. 2, lines 1-3. This shortcoming is discussed in the specification and addressed by the application aggregation function of the present invention. See, e.g., Specification, page 15, lines 11-25. Specifically, the application aggregation function 45 of the present invention "further aggregates the multiplicity of wireless data applications 40 of the incompatibility of the various wireless networks." Id., page 16, lines 17-19 (Emphasis added). In short, the present invention can accommodate multiple wireless data applications from multiple wireless application providers, each of which may be incompatible with the others.

Furthermore, the present invention operates using GSM, CDMA, TDMA, FDMA, and any other interface standard conjunctively, providing means to communicate between heretofore, incompatible interface standards. Specifically:

> A problem with current wireless communications, however, is that air interface standards, e.g., access schemes, between base stations and telephone units are not universally applied.

Id., page 3, lines 6-8. Moreover:

> These various techniques as well as others not described herein but well-known to the art are incompatible with one another insofar as a transceiver designed for a TDMA interface cannot communicate intelligently with a telephone unit designed for either a FDMA or a CDMA interface and vice versa. This lack of uniformity or standardization poses a serious problem for those trying to further standardize wireless communication.

Id., page 4, lines 13-18.

Such a function and feature are not taught, mentioned or suggested by the Holmes reference, which contemplates a single, common communication protocol, i.e., GSM, TDMA, FDMA, or CDMA.

The Holmes reference also does not teach, mention or suggest conversion and/or reformatting of a first language into a second language. The gateway function 52 of the

present invention, however, reformats incoming messages that are formatted in a first language, e.g., HTML, into a language that is more compatible and suitable for a hand-held device, e.g., XML, and vice versa. See, e.g., Id., page 17, lines 7-11. Therefore claims 13, 14, 21, 22, 26, and 27 are not anticipated or made obvious by Holmes.

The Holmes reference also does not teach, mention or suggest an inter-carrier exchange router 54 and cross-technology handling function 55 that enable remote users to exchange voice and data messages with other remote users who may not share the same PCS carrier or air interface. See, e.g., Id., page 18, lines 9-21. Therefore claims 16-18, 23, and 28 also are not anticipated or made obvious by Holmes.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that, the claims 1-29 are not anticipated by the Holmes references, and further, satisfy all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 100, et seq., especially § 102(b). Accordingly, claims 1-29 are allowable. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is requested.

The Applicant believes that no further fees are required. However, if for any reason a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 9, 2003

By: _____
George W. Hartnell, III
Reg. No. 42,639
Attorney for Applicant(s)

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 9169
Boston, MA 02209
(617) 517-5523
Customer No.: 21,874